

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Status of the Application

Claims 1-6 and 8-12 are currently pending, with claims 7 and 13 being canceled without prejudice, and claims 1 and 11 being amended. As support for the amendments is provided by the application (including the claims) as filed, no new matter has been introduced into the application by way of these amendments.

Summary of the Office Action

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, due to the inclusion of the term “measured according to ISO 4288.”

Claims 1-12 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of, U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0182538 (Tomita et al.).

Discussion

Turning initially to the Section 112 rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that the inclusion of a well-established, standardized test in a claim is not improper, and indeed serves to clarify the subject matter Applicants consider to be their invention. The presence of the ISO standard in the claim is analogous to a unit of measure set forth immediately after recitation of a numerical range, *e.g.*, MPa or g/L. Here, the claimed invention requires a surface roughness (Ra) which is measured according to a certain standard, and Applicants duly (and properly, it is submitted) recited that standard in the claims.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection is respectfully solicited.

Turning to the anticipation rejection (in connection with independent claims 1 and 11 as amended by the incorporation of subject matter from claim 7 therein), the Office Action, relative to claim 7, suggests that Tomita et al. discloses a process for the synthesis of an alkali-soluble resin containing a siloxane structure [0392]. Although the Office Action

admits that Tomita et al. is silent relative to the formation of a separate layer containing the siloxane resin, it asserts that the siloxane resin will form a separate layer because chemical compositions are inseparable from their characteristics. *See Office Action, page 5.*

Tomita et al., it is respectfully asserted, does not disclose or suggest the preparation of the claimed invention which includes *inter alia* a water-repellant polymer as a dissolution inhibitor. In particular, the claims describe the water-repellant polymer as a block- or graft-copolymer of a poly(alkylene oxide) block and a block comprising siloxane and/or perfluoroalkyl units. In contrast, Tomita et al. at ¶ [0392] discloses a phenolic resin that is reacted with an epoxy-type terminal reactive silicone. This reaction does not result in the preparation of a block- or graft-copolymer of a poly(alkylene oxide) block and a block comprising siloxane and/or perfluoroalkyl units.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Withdrawal of the prior art rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

As Applicants believe the application is in proper condition for allowance, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass the application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher T. Griffith/

Christophe r T. Griffith, Reg. No. 33,392
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: February 14, 2008